THE Middle-Way

In One paper of

THE COVENANTS,

LAW and GOSPEL.

With Indifferency between the

LEGALIST & ANTINOMIAN.

By J. H.

Doing nothing by Partiality,

LONDON,

Printed for T. Parkhurst, at the Bible and Three Crowns in *Cheap-side*, 1674.

A

OF

The Covenants.

IT is one reaſon of my ſending out theſe ſheets thus in ſingle Papers, that I may have the opportunity my ſelf of Reflexion. If any thing be wanting I may ſupply it; where I am in the dark I may explain it, or call for Light; If I erre, I may correct it, and put my ſelf at eaſe ſtill when I need, as to the whole. It is verily a fooliſh thing I count for any man to think that he can ſpeak or write ſo, as what he hath once ſpoken or written cannot be mended. When we change our thoughts every day and week in our private Studies, what a vain reſolution is it, that becauſe we have Preached or Printed thus, the ſhutters muſt be drawen up preſently, and no more Light be let, to come in upon us. For my part I declare, I will never Preach or Print upon ſuch termes, but upon theſe: That I may be miſtaken; That I may acknowledg it, if I be convinced. That I may therefore be controuled, and have leave to be indifferent to my own opinion, as to anothers.

Two Papers I have ſent out already.

The first (or that which in order should be first) is of *Election and Redemption*, wherein I observe some things to be misplaced at the Press, but so long as the things be put in, and my notion proposed, I am sollicitous about nothing else. That God would have all to be saved, and therefore prepares that grace for all that is *sufficient*, which is his *antecedent will*: and that then he foresees who they be that will comply with that grace and and who not, and by his *consequent will* decrees the one to salvation, and the other to damnation, is that Doctrin in the maine, that is the *Rachel* of the *Schools*. For the latter part whereof, I have given my thoughts in that paper: the former part requires a little further consideration. That the goodness of God is advanced towards all, I like well, and that they lay the blame on man only that he perishes, and that they are so careful against *Pelagius*, for therefore do they bring in a *sufficient* grace for all, because man shall be allowed him to do nothing that disposes him to conversion or justification by his *own strength* without grace; nevertheless whether this *sufficient grace* of theirs is to pass or not, is the question. There is the *universal concourse of God* with man in all his acts as the first cause, *in whom we live and move and have our being*: and there is that influx or assistance of his, we call *Grace*. It would be known in the first place, what is the difference between these. That assistance of God which goes to the *acts of Nature*, and the preservation thereof, is the *common concourse of his Providence*, that assistance of his which goes to the production of acts *above Nature*, is called *Grace*. By Nature we mean corrupt Nature, and by acts above Nature we mean such acts as we should not do according to our natural inclination, if it were not for supernatural help, that is, some further operation or influence on us from God then that which goes only to our natural preservation. Grace then in short is that Divine assistance which *Elevates* Nature, and *heales* it. This Grace is twofold, the Divine motion, or habitual disposition; *habitualis gratia*, or *divina motio*; the infused habit, or Divine operation. It is said now in the Schools that there is this difference between *infused* habits, and *acquired*, that when the one do introduce only a *facility* to the action but presuppose the power, the other

other do bring the *power* it ſelf, as without which we *can do nothing*. This is ſpoken I count very agreeably to the Scripture, which ſets forth man in his natural ſtate as *dead in ſin*, and the work of Grace by *regeneration* and *new life*, with many the like expreſſions: nevertheleſs, as there muſt be ſome limits fixt for the right interpretation of ſuch places which in effect muſt come to that which I have given in my firſt paper, (that there is indeed ſuch an *indiſpoſition* on all men through original corruption, as that there is no man ever *does*, *did*, or *will* repent, do his duty, and *live*, but it is, was, and muſt be through Gods eſpecial Grace, and yet are we to account for all that, that they *have power*, that they *may* if they *will*, that the covenant of grace requires not any thing which is impoſſible, for both theſe are to be held): So muſt I crave liberty to enter my different opinion. It was *Pelagius* his conceit (*I have noted in one of my other papers*) that grace ſerved only to help the *power*, when St. *Auguſtine* proves that it *inclines the will*, and works in us the *deed*: my thoughts now lye partly between both, that the *Poſſe* or *Power* indeed is of *Nature*, and Grace or the operation of God is that which drawes that power into the Will, or *Act*, that is makes us willing; This act of the Will laies an impreſſion on the ſoul inclining it to the like acts; Theſe acts iterated turns that inclination to an habit, that is Habitual grace, *infuſed* if you pleaſe, *per modum acquiſitorum*. The *agere*, the act muſt preſuppoſe the *poſſe*, the *power*, That's certain. If the habit then brought the power, the *Divine motion*, or preventing grace which goes before the *habit*, did nothing. You will ſay, There is a double power, a *remote* or *next* power. The remote power is of nature, but the next power is of grace, and ſufficient grace gives to all a next power. Let me ask you then, whether there be any further grace after we have the next power, to make us willing, or to give us alſo the will and deed. If you grant it, you may make the moſt of your *ſufficient* grace, I will not quarrel with you for it: But when the *poſſe* (the *power*) is of nature, and the *Will* and *Deed* is of that grace which is more than *ſufficient*, I would faine know why nature and effectual grace alone ſhould not ſerve the turn, and

whether

whether sufficient grace over and above these is not indeed more than needs? Here I stick where I left.

The second paper is of *Justification*, and of this I count there are two parts. The one is, a *reconciliation of* St. *James* and *Paul*, and so of *faith* and *works* in that point: which I must needs say, having lain in my thoughts (& the main notion in Paper by me) this 16 or 18 Years or upwards, I cannot but be very throughly satisfied with, and much the rather, when I see the same growing up in late Books; as particularly in those most judicious temperate *Theses* of *Le Blanc*, and Mr. *Trumans Great Preparation*. The other is concerning the *imputation of Christs Righteousness*, wherein I will confess, though in my judgment I am perswaded that what I have writ is the truth, and it is nothing but truth that made me write it: yet does my heart a little misgive me, that it were better to let pious men alone to such apprehensions as they have imbibed, though mingled with much darkness and some errour, in such a point as this, where so much of their peace and life is bound up, then to offer them any unsettlement by clearer light, though I were able indeed to bring it to them. I may be allowed to be sorry if I *offend* any body, but I ought to have a care I *stumble* none, who are good men and live godly; Neither would I streighten my own soul If there be any thing more therefore in the imputation of Christs righteousness then I have expressed in that paper, which I know not, I doe not part with my portion in it, I protest thus much, but will rather renounce all upon the conviction to cleave to it.

That Christs righteousness does justify us *from the Law*, and so from sin, and from condemnation, I do hold no less then others: but that Christs righteousness does justify us *by the Law*, is an overgrown conception. It is certain, that no works of man be we never so holy, are able to stand before God in his disstrict judgment, that is, if he should deal with us according to the exact justice of the Law without shewing us any mercy, which will be acknowledged by *Protestants* and *Papists*, who are ready to pray *both* with *David*, *Enter not into judgment with*

with thy servants O Lord, for in thy sight shall no flesh living be justified. If any *Papist* then shall think that mans righteousnes is made so perfect by Christs merits: or, any *Protestant* that Christs righteousnes it self is so made ours, as that we are justified by the Law, upon that account, they are both mistaken. This is the only true extreamity on both sides: for it is not by the *Law*, but by *Faith*; by the *Evangelical* covenant, or by *Grace* that we are justified. *We are not under the Law*, sayes the the Apostle, *but under grace*. It is enough for a poor sinner to have a righteousnes imputed to him *without works*, and that he is pardoned: but to have a righteousnes imputed to him *with works*, is more then we can find to be allowed him. Christs righteousnes is such, and to have that made ours *in it self*, or so, as that in Gods reckoning we must be as righteous as he, I must needs say, it is not harder perhaps to believe that the bread is turned into Christs body (where we have a text for it) in the Sacrament: then to believe such a conceit (for which we have no Scripture at all) in the matter of Justification. What then? Do I deny Imputation? No, but I explain it. It is by the righteousnes of Christ, *not inherent in us*, our Divines will say Ordinarily, *but imputed to us*, that we are justified. And what if I thus interpret this for them, that is, not *as if we had done in his person what Christ did*, but by his righteousnes *made ours* in the *effects* only? So the very Learned Bishop *Forbs* expresly, *Hoc est, Quoad effectum & fructum* (See *Considerationes modestæ. De justificatione*, l. 2. c. 2.) I will use the same words as they use, but I am not bound to the same construction. Even as I will speak of mans insufficiency (I mentioned before) as other Divines do, and as the Scriptures do, that *we can do nothing*: but I will keep the due interpretation. I will say we *can*, and that we *cannot*, without loss of my liberty: for I must understand it with its right measures. I will say I *can* in confession of my sin, and acknowledging God just: I will say I *cannot* in the sense of my corruption, and the imploring his grace.

Indeed a man can hardly consider the Doctrin of St. *James* never so little with that of *Paul* which is one part of my paper, but will lead him to the other, which is to see that what

our

our Proteſtants ſay ordinarily on this matter, does need a favourable expoſition. It is a jejune thing, I count, to bring the great diſpute that *Paul* hath with the Jewes about juſtification to this reſult only, whether we are juſtified by *Faith*, or the proper *Work* or *Fruits* of it? It is but a little more ſatisfactory to bring it only to this, whether it be by the obſervation of *Moſes* Law? For though this was the occaſion of the diſpute, and the Apoſtle therefore does ſhew them how it was by the *Promiſe*, and ſo by *Faith* that *Abraham* and the *Jewes* themſelves had life, and not by the *Law*, which was but a *Schoolmaſter* to lead them thereunto, or *unto Chriſt*: yet it is manifeſt, that he advances the point higher, while he tells them that by *Works* neither *Jew* nor *Gentile* could be juſtified, ſo that by *works* he muſt mean the obſervation of that *Law of works* which was common to both, and not *Moſes* Law only: and the reſolution of the diſpute in both *Apoſtles* comes to this (as I have ſaid) that it is by the performance of the covenant of *Grace*, and not of the covenant of *works*, or Law of *Moſes*, that a man is to look for life everlaſting. I muſt add, Nor are they to be heard in a third place, who ſay, that the diſpute between *Paul* and the *Jewes* is neither of theſe, but whether we are juſtified by our own righteouſneſs, or by the righteouſneſs of Chriſt, and ſo reſolve that it is not by any *works* which we do, even *Faith* it ſelf as a *work*, but by the *works* Chriſt hath done for us, that is by the obedience of his life and death only. For though this be taught ordinarily by our *Proteſtants*, and is coincident with the firſt reſult, there is one thing I muſt ſay theſe *Divines* have not conſidered which I have offered them in my paper, that muſt bring them to another underſtanding. It is this, that the *Apoſtle* does indeed ſtand much upon the *Righteouſneſs of God* in oppoſition to *works*, in the buſineſs of juſtification, but never oppoſes our *works* to the *Righteouſneſs of Chriſt*: the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt in their ſenſe being truly a very contrary thing to the *Righteouſneſs of God* in the ſenſe of the *Apoſtle*. The righteouſneſs of God according to the *Apoſtle*, if I may then deſcribe it but as well as I can, and as the thing is, and a little more fully then I have in my former paper, is, on *Gods part*, his taking our human frailty nature

nature into that meet conſideration, as not to deale with us in his *diſtrict judgment* which we cannot beare, but according to his *Covenant of Mercy:* the righteouſneſs, ſacrifice, attonement or ſatisfaction of Chriſt being ſuppoſed as the foundation upon which his Juſtice does ſtand good, notwithſtanding this condeſcention: And conſequently on *Mans part*, this righteouſneſs is our imperfect duty performed in ſincerity according to this *new Law*, and ſo for Chriſts ſake accepted to Salvation. In this ſenſe am I apt to underſtand that *everlaſting Righteouſneſs* which is *brought in*, by the Meſſiah, or by his covenant, in *Daniel:* and in this ſenſe do I conſtrue that Title, *The Lord our Righteouſneſs*. Only when I have ſaid in my former paper, *that it is not appropriated to the ſecond Perſon*, I deſire not to be ſo taken, as if I ſuppoſed that by the *Branch* in the two Texts of *Jeremy* where we find it, *Zerubabble* only was meant (though a total ſilence in the new Teſtament of ſo pertinent a quotation for Chriſt, if it were ſpoken of him, might well tempt *Grotius* to that interpretation) but that, the Divinity of Chriſt being thereby aſſerted, it is a *Title* that muſt belong to him as *God*, and not as *Second perſon*. For the Son is Lord, and the Father is Lord, and the Holy Ghoſt Lord: and yet not three Lords, but one Lord, *The Lord our Righteouſneſs*.

There is the *uncreated, abſolute* righteouſneſs of God, which is the Divine eſſence it ſelf, for as God is *Truth* in the abſtract, ſo is he *Righteouſneſs*: or the *created, relative* righteouſneſs of God, that is his righteouſneſs ſet forth in relation to us, which conſiſts in his dealing with us as his Creatures according to our conditions. This *relative* righteouſneſs then is double. The *Righteouſneſs* or *Juſtice* of God according to the Covenant of works: and the righteouſneſs or equity of God according to the Covenant of grace. The one I count to be that our Divines call his *Strict*: the other his *Paternal* Juſtice. When God made man at firſt and gave him the Law of his Creation, he was to deale with him according to this perfect Law, and it was but equal according to his perfect ſtate, and this being the original righteouſneſs (as I may ſay) of God in relation to us, there are none of us but do find ſome ſenſe of it in our hearts, that makes us not ſo much only to *fear*, as to be *afraid* of him

under that apprehenſion. But there is another *righteouſneſs* then this, which was ever afoot in the world ſince the promiſe of the *womans ſeed*, or elſe there were no man could have bin Saved, though it be ſaid to be now *manifeſted* (as *brought in*, in *Daniels* phraſe) becauſe the reaſon upon which it is founded, that is mans reconciliation to God by Chriſt, is revealed by the Goſpel, and this is the *righteouſneſs of God* oppoſed to *works* (or to his ſtrict Juſtice which he was bound to exerciſe according to the *Covenant of works*) that is ſo magnified by the Apoſtle. And here now is a diſtinction to be uſed which I want Termes to expreſs. For this righteouſneſs of God muſt be conſidered *with regard to himſelf*, which is his dealing with us according to the *Covenant of Faith* for Chriſts ſake, when he might deale with us according to the *Covenant of Nature* if he would: and *with regard to us*, or to the condition upon which he does ſo mercifully deale with us. As the *Love of God* is taken in Scripture both for his *Love towards us*, and our *Love of him*: So is the *Righteouſneſs of God* taken for both theſe, his dealing with us according to this covenant, and the condition on our part which he accepts. And hence is it, that when it is called the *Righteouſneſs of God* in one place, it is called the *Righteouſneſs of Faith* in another; and in a third, the *Righteouſneſs which is of God by Faith*. Now when it is our faith, our repentance, our new obedience which is the *Righteouſneſs of God* it ſelf (taken----help me to two Termes) whereby we are juſtified in oppoſition to the *works of the Law*, which no man can perform to be juſtified by them: and our Divines by *works* will underſtand all good works, even this faith it ſelf as a work (as was ſaid), and our Evangelical obedience, inſomuch as when there is no righteouſneſs but what is *without us* can be oppoſed to theſe, it makes them by the *Righteouſneſs of God* to underſtand the *Righteouſneſs of Chriſt* who is God, and by faith the righteouſneſs of Chriſt *apprehended by Faith*, which are in good earneſt conceptions ſo ſtrained: it appeares (if I may uſe thoſe words in humility) how *being ignorant of the Righteouſneſs of God* in the right notion, *and going about to eſtabliſh* in a contrary vein to the *Jews* a righteouſneſs which is not their *own* but anothers, in the ſtead of that which it is not,

they

they have not *ſubmitted* to the truth, in this Doctrin of Juſtification.

And herein now (farther) does appeare the ground of reconciliation between the Papiſts and us upon the point. For when the one and the other (let their Books be conſulted) do goe on the ſuppoſition that it is by the Law (the Law of works) that we are juſtified, this *Hypotheſis* being removed, the oppoſition on both ſides falls to the ground. That no man can bring or plead any ſuch righteouſneſs of his *own* before God as anſwers the Law, the Proteſtant muſt needs be in the right, and conſequently if it were by the Law that we muſt ſtand or fall at his Tribunal, there was a neceſſity for their bringing in the righteouſneſs of Chriſt made ours by faith (as they do) to juſtify us: but when indeed it is not ſo, when it is not (I ſay) by the *Law*, but by the *Covenant of Grace*, or by the *Goſpel* that we are to be judged, it is ſome wonder to me, this plain truth ſhould be no better underſtood. That Gods judging a man to have performed the condition of the covenant of grace is the accounting or declaring him righteous; and that Gods accounting a man righteous is his juſtification. *Let no man deceive you* (ſays St. *John*) *he that doth righteouſneſs, is righteous.* That righteouſneſs which makes a man righteous and denominates him righteous, is that righteouſneſs which makes God account him righteous. But this is the righteouſneſs which he *does*. Note it, for it is expreſs. And what righteouſneſs is that? Why, Not the righteouſneſs of *works* which no man *does*: but the righteouſneſs of the Goſpel, that is in the ſtile of the other Apoſtle, a righteouſneſs *without works* (to wit, without the works of the Law, or perfect works, in the ſenſe he ſayes alſo God juſtifies the *ungodly*) ſo that it is by *Grace*, while it it by this *Righteouſneſs* (which does and muſt lean on the merits of Chriſt no leſs then we ſay Faith it ſelf does) that we are juſtified and ſaved.

That the end of Chriſts coming into the world, of our redemption, and the Covenant of Grace, was that we ſhould be holy and righteous is ſaid ordinarily by Divines according to the Scriptures, but the right and plain underſtanding or reaſon of what they ſay, is not ſo ordinary. *He hath choſen up in*

Chriſt that we ſhould be holy. He hath redeemed us from iniquity that we ſhould be a peculiar People. We are his workmanſhip created unto good works in (or through) Chriſt Jeſus. When God made man at firſt and gave him a Law, it was that he ſhould live Holy. When righteouſneſs then was the end of his *Creation* and the Law thereof, how is this ſaid to be the end of his *Redemption*? I anſwer. Righteouſneſs (or holineſs as they are one) we muſt know, does lye in a conformity to the Law which God gives us. There is nothing elſe, and nothing leſs then this (the full performance of a Law given) that is Righteouſneſs. Upon this account, as ſoon as man once fell and broke the Law of his creation, it was impoſſible he ſhould be righteous any more, unleſs there were a new Law brought in, in the performance whereof he might attain to that again which he had loſt. Now to this end was it, that Chriſt came and died, this was the very main buſineſs (*I count*) of his Redemption, even the procuring this new Law, or another Law with lower termes, which ſome men performing, they do thereby become righteous, and ſo have righteouſneſs, according to that Law, imputed to them for remiſſion, and life Eternal. Here you ſee what that righteouſneſs indeed is which Chriſt is ſaid to *bring in*, and in what ſenſe he hath brought it in, or how ſuch Texts (as thoſe before) do attribute our Holineſs to him. The obedience of Chriſts life and death, we know, was fulfilled on earth, and of this he himſelf hath once ſaid, *It is finiſhed:* But the righteouſneſs he is ſaid to *bring in*, is called an *Everlaſting righteouſneſs*. And what then can that be, but the *righteouſneſs of the Goſpel*, which upon the ſame account alſo is called the *Everlaſting Goſpel*? That is, becauſe it is by *this* righteouſneſs in oppoſition to that of the *Law* (or the righteouſneſs of *works*) that all men from the beginning of the world to the end of it, (and ſo is it to be accounted ever of force) do obtain everlaſting Salvation.

I know the great difficulty of this Doctrin will lye on the point of remiſſion. Our Divines do generally place juſtification in the remiſſion of Sin; ſo do the *Papiſts* (with ſomething elſe), and ſo have I my ſelf after others. Nevertheleſs, as I remember St. *Auguſtine* in one place does find *fault* with this

in

in *Pelagius*: ſo hath the perplexity of it of late lead me into the like thoughts. The truth is, Pardon of Sin is a *benefit* unto which the juſtified perſon is adjudged, as eternal life is: but remiſſion of Sin muſt not be made the *formal reaſon* of juſtification. Our Divines may define juſtification to be an Act of Grace whereby God gives us Eternal Life (or a right to it,) as well as, *an act of grace whereby he pardons our ſins.* That act, that very only act wherein the form of juſtification does lye, is Gods accounting or pronouncing a man righteous, and this is a forenſical act, according to Law, the Law, or Covenant of grace; Which covenant promiſing *Forgiveneſs* and *Life* upon the performance of its Conditions, when a man hath performed them, he hath a right to thoſe benefits, and when God does declare or account that a man hath performed them (which is all one as to judge him righteous), theſe benefits flow to him from that judgment (or are confer'd on him by that act) as *Effects* of that cauſe, and conſequently cannot be the very act it ſelf, which is the *cauſe* of them.

To forgive a mans ſin, and declare him righteous are two things inconſiſtent one with another in the ſame reſpect, and therefore when God pronounces a man juſt, it is according to the *Law of Faith*, and when he pardons his Sin, it is in reſpect to the *Law of works*. And how then can two acts incompatable but in divers reſpects (*cùm omne ens ſit unum*) be made to enter one and the ſame definition?

It is true as all agree, that there are no works that man does, or can doe, able to make God any amends for our offences, ſo that remiſſion of ſin muſt be attributed altogether to the merits of Chriſt in regard to the attonement made. But we muſt diſtinguiſh of Remiſſion, Remiſſion is either *Conditional* and *Univerſal* as it lyes in the Covenant, and is the purchaſe of Chriſt: or *Actual*, as it lyes in the application thereof to *particular* perſons upon performance of the condition. When Divines do ſay we can doe nothing our ſelves for procuring reconciliation and remiſſion, it is to be underſtood of Conditional univerſal remiſſion. No mortal could do any thing toward the obtaining of that. *God was in Chriſt reconciling the World unto himſelf not imputing their treſpaſſes.*

But

But as for remiſſion Actual, that man muſt be blind who ſees not that God does every where require us to repent, beleeve, confeſs our faults, forſake them, do good works, forgive others, that we may have pardon, and be ſaved. Conditional pardon now is *antecedent* to a mans juſtification, and contained in our redemption. *In whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveneſs of Sins.* Actual remiſſion is *ſubſequent* to juſtification, for we muſt be ſuppoſed firſt to have performed the condition and be pronounced righteous, and then pardoned. When there is no remiſſion then but what does either *goe before*, or *follow* juſtification, it cannot be made the very act it ſelf of our juſtification.

There is one Text may be oppoſed. *Even as David alſo deſcribed the bleſſedneſs of the man unto whom God imputeth Righteouſneſs without works. Saying, Bleſſed are they whoſe iniquities are forgiven.* It ſeems that the *Righteouſneſs* which Paul ſpeaks of *without works* in the one verſe, is deſcribed by *pardon* in the other. This I my ſelf have alleadged, but upon farther conſideration I anſwer. *The man to whom* God imputeth righteouſneſs without works, or the *bleſſedneſs* of *that* man, is deſcribed: but we may ſuppoſe, not *the Righteouſneſs without works*. The ſcope of the Apoſtle is plainly to ſhew us only, that it is not by *works of the Law*, or ſuch works as would make the *reward of debt* and not of *grace* (as appeares in the immediate verſes before) which are *perfect* works, that a man is juſtified. And he proves it by this argument, becauſe *the man is bleſſed whoſe ſins are forgiven*; that is as much as to ſay, not he who is without ſin, but he who hath ſin and it is forgiven. The man who is bleſſed is juſtified. But the man who is bleſſed hath ſin to be forgiven. Therefore the righteouſneſs which a man hath, or is imputed to him, is not a righteouſneſs according to the Law of works, but according to the Covenant of Grace. This I ſay is the ſcope of the place. Gods *imputing Righteouſneſs* to a perſon is indeed a phraſe ſignifying Gods accounting him righteous or juſtifying him: and the Apoſtle Proves a man is juſtified *without works*, (that is perfect works) becauſe he hath ſin to be covered. I will yet repeate, The man to whom righteouſneſs is imputed without works, is *pardoned*:

but

but it followes not, that this *Righteousnes without works is pardon*. To have righteousnes imputed to a man without works, is all one as to have faith imputed to him for righteousnes, so repentance or evangelical obedience, and that is not pardon, though these are never divided from the same subject. I will conclude therefore with that I have said once before, & will say it again at my parting with the point that it is strange to me our Protestant Divines should be so off ward to this cleer Determination. To wit, God judges (or I will judge) all men according to the Gospel; Those who perform the condition of it, he accounts or pronounces righteous. They whom he accounts righteous, are justified. I will add, That, the righteousnes of *Christ* which is the *meritorious cause* of our justification without dispute on all hands (that is the *impulsive procatartick cause*), which alwayes comes under the *Efficient*, cannot for the same reason be the *Formal*, or *Material* cause of it. It is not the *infusion of Righteousnes* with the *Papist*, which is our sanctification; nor the *imputation of Christs righteousnes* with the *Protestant*, which is not to be understood but *in genere causæ Efficientis*; nor *remission of Sin*, with Protestant and Papist, which I have now bin disproving: but the imputing to a person his performance of the new covenant for righteousnes, or the accounting or pronouncing him righteous according to that covenant, is the *form*, formal Cause, or *formal Reason* of his justification.

Do not think this strange, Justification (I will grant) *virtually* or *Eminenter* (as *unum aggregatum*) containes in it many things, and so *remission* among others (for we must find line to speak as Divines use): but Justification *Formaliter* (as *unum simplex*) I say, is only Gods pronouncing us *Just* (or sincere penitent believers), and *remission* is a *benefit* which *in order of Nature* does *follow* the performance of that condition.

And so I proceed to my third Paper, Of the Covenants, Of the Law and Gospel.

For the Doctrin of the *Covenants*. There is the Covenant of *Works* (say Divines); and the Covenant of *Grace*. The Covenant of works (say they) was made with *Adam* in his

in

integrity being that Law which is written in all mens hearts, and ſo requires perfection, and for the leaſt tranſgreſſion threatens Death. The Covenant of grace is made with man in his Eſtate fallen (or with Chriſt in his behalf), and requires only our Faith, repentance, and ſincerity, unto Life, which being held forth under the Title of the *Promiſe* to *Adam*, *Abraham*, *David*, and all during the Law, was ratified by the death and blood of Chriſt the Redeemer under the Goſpel, and ſo promulgated to the world, to continue ſtill on force (and in that, as in one regard, called *new*) as long as that laſts. *Behold the dayes come ſaith the Lord when I will make a new Covenant, not according to the Covenant I made with their fathers in the day when I took them by the hand to lead them out of Egypt.* Here is the *Old* Covenant and the *New* Covenant. The Old is that which God made with the Jews when *Moſes* lead them in the wilderneſs. The New is that which we have under the Goſpel. The old Covenant then is not the Covenant of *works*; for that was made with all in *Adam*, and as written in our hearts, muſt be eternally obligatory. But the old Covenant was made with the *Jews* in oppoſition to other Nations, and as peculiar to them is vaniſhed, and binds not. Neither is it the Covenant of *grace* for the ſame reaſon, as alſo becauſe the covenant of grace is the new covenant, but the New is not the Old. The Old and New covenants ſay Divines indeed ordinarily, are both the covenant of grace in oppoſition to that of works, the ſame in *ſubſtance*, but differing in the *Adminiſtration*. But this with me is not ſo eaſy to be received without the diſtinction of an *A* and *The* in the caſe. The Old covenant may be a covenant of grace, or covenant of works, or both, but not the covenant of works, or the covenant of grace. There are ſome plead it is a *ſubſervient* covenant as *Camero*. Some that it is a *mixt* covenant as *Ball*. Some that it is a covenant of *works* as the *Leyden* Divines. The moſt of our own late Divines, do make it a covenant of grace. Whereof one voluminous Authour denying the other three opinions, does yet ſay it was ſo diſpenſed as to tender life both upon the condition of Faith, and works. But if it propoſed life on condition of perfect doing, it was a covenant of works: If on

be

believing too, a Covenant mixt both of Works and Grace: And as perfect doing was urged only in tendency to believing, a Covenant-Subservient; and so all say true as to the main; and yet none so distinctly true, as to leave any enquiring man without confusion in what they say. There is one thing then *I* apprehend will serve much for the enodation of many difficulties in theis matter, and that is to conceive aright what the Old Covenant is: And there is another like it to the same purpose, to know what kind of Covenant it was.

As for the former, we have hitherto been seeing but what it is *not* only; now to understand what it *is*, Let us separate what *Moses* did deliver to the *Israelites*, from that which was before in promise to the *Patriarks* as single by it self, and this is the Old Covenant. Or, take that, and all that whatsoever, and in what manner soever, that was *added* to the Covenant of Grace, which *Abraham* and the *Patriarks* were under, and that abstracted therefrom, is *I* count, the Old Covenant. Let me yet speak more fully; Take *Abraham* before he was ninety years old, when he at first Believed, and that Faith was imputed to him for Righteousness, upon which he became the Father of the faithful, while as yet he was in his Uncircumcision (for the Law of Circumcision which was after given in peculiar reference to his natural Seed the Jews, in pursuance of the temporal Benediction, is to be reckoned as Preambulatory to the Law, and belonging to it), and when you have pared away Circumcision, and all that which *Moses* commanded the Jews afterwards, from *Walk before me* only, *and be perfect*; all this rest, this pared away from that, whatsoever it be, is *I* say, the Old Covenant, or the *Law* strictly taken. From this in the first place, we have light to distinguish between the Law taken *strictly* and *largely*: In regard whereof, we shall find the Apostles somtimes proving the *Righteousness of Faith* from the Law, being *witnessed by the Law and the Prophets*; and another time setting the Law and Gospel at the widest distance and opposition. As the Law is taken *comprehensively* for the promise to *Abraham*, as well as the Covenant made with the Jews (that is for the whole state they stood in, who were under the Law, by vertue of the Covenant confirm'd to their fore-Fa-

thers, as by vertue of that given by *Moſes*), the Law and Goſpel are confounded. As the Law is taken *ſtrictly* or *preciſely* for the Old Covenant, or the Law of *Moſes* with Circumciſion its appurtenance, that is for all that apart that was *added* to the promiſe before-going, and abſtracted there-from as *I* have ſaid, ſo are they diſtinguiſhed, and their differences to be owned and maintained. In the next place, we may underſtand from this, how the Jews were under both conditions of Believing and Doing: Of *doing this and live*; and of *believing* alſo *that they might be ſaved*. To wit, As the Covenant of Grace was delivered to their fore-Fathers, and ſo on foot before, it muſt needs hold forth life to them on their Faith, as well as to *Abraham* their Progenitour, who received Circumciſion as a Seal of *Righteouſneſs* thereby (or to come thereby), and not by the Law, which as yet was not given. And as the Law was *added* (as the Apoſtle ſpeaks) to this Covenant or Promiſe, it did tye the Jews to a performance of it as a condition of *living* by it, in ſome ſenſe, as neither the Patriarks before, nor we ſince are under; and in regard whereof that which is ſaid by a reverend perſon, that the *Old Teſtament-Spirit* was a *fearing Spirit*, with the like expreſſions, are not without a truth in them, that deſires more conſideration then *One* of late does give them: Eſpecially when the Apoſtle is ſo expreſs that the Jews were under a *School-Maſter*, and we are not under that School-Maſter. That the Covenant from *Sinai engendered to Bondage*; but where the Spirit of the Lord is, or the New Teſtament is, there is *Liberty*. From this yet in the third place, we may enlarge our light further, to judge of that abrogation of the Law, or deliverance from it, which Chriſtians have under the Goſpel. A glorious thing (the Apoſtle counts it), that puts us directly into ſuch an eſtate and condition as the Patriarks, and thoſe holy men before *Abraham* were in, to live according to the light and liberty of their Conſciences, that is according to the Law of Nature, which as it is in the hands of *Chriſt*, and not of *Moſes*, to wit, as delivered from the Yoke of his Ceremonies, and the ſuperſtition of Idolaters, and adminiſtred with *Grace* and the *Spirit*, with *Grace* in God's acceptation of our ſincerity inſtead of perfect obedience for the Redeemers ſake, and with the

Spirit

Spirit in his assistance of us for the performance, is both the Universal Religion of Man-kind, and the substance of that which is Christian unto this day. I should quote *Eusebius, De præp. Evan.* See his *Ecc. Hist. l.* 1. *c.* 5. From whence also, we see in the way, how the Covenant of Grace which *Abraham* and all those holy men which went before him, or that ever were, have had as well as we, is yet called the New Covenant; and that is, it is called New, as the lump is called a *new lump* by the Apostle to the *Corinths*. That Church was leavened by the ill example of vicious Members, particularly of the incestuous person, they are therefore commanded to cast him out, and that they should not mingle themselves, or keep company with the scandalous, and in so doing, they should become, as it were, a new body, or lump, though they were still otherwise but the same Community. *Purge out therefore the old Leaven, that you may be a new Lump.* So is it with the Covenant, it was made by God with all man-kind in Christ, ever since the beginning of the World, and confirmed to the Patriarchs (it being impossible else that any should have been saved), and yet it is called a New Covenant in relation to us under the Gospel; because I say that, that which was *added* to it by *Moses*, to wit, all that which properly is the Old Covenant, is removed or purged away, as the Leaven in the *Jews* Feast, by Christ our Pass-over, who hath been Sacrificed, and made for us that expurgation. *And if that which is done away was glorious, how much more that which remains?* That which is done away, was the Ministration of death engraven in stone, and of the Letter that killeth: That which remaineth, is the Ministration of the New Testament, of the Spirit which giveth Life, and of Righteousness. *That which remaineth*, I pray note it, That cannot be said to *remain* which was not before extant. The Covenant of Grace with the Patriarchs, and the New Covenant with us, being the very same, as I have said, but ours only called *New*, (or renewed) upon the abolishing of that which was super-added, as upon this remaining too it self, never to wax old and vanish.

For the latter, what kind of Covenant I take this to be, I am now in order to tell you. The Old Covenant, as to me it seemeth, was a kind of Political Covenant made with the Nation of

the *Jews*, as Princes compacts are with their people, when they first set up Government. God promises them his Protection, that he would lead them to a fruitful Land; overcome all their Enemies, with the like blessings; and they promise him they will be ruled by him. To this purpose did God in sundry ways appear to them to *Moses*, to their Elders, to them all in the Clouds and Fire; and then causes a Tabernacle to be made for him, which was a Keeping house among them, where the Sacrifices and Offerings was his Provision, and the Priests his Servants that lived on him; and unto that Tabernacle and Ark, might they repair for Counsel and Judgment. This People then being peculiarly under a Theocracy, which *Samuel* in two places does expressly signify (at least until the time of *Saul*), so that the Church and Common-wealth of the *Jews* were but one, according to the Apostle; it is no wonder if Religion be made their Laws, and so required of them, together with other political Ordinances and Statutes, for their happiness or publick peace as a Nation. From hence is it, that though their Law is not to be judged the Covenant of Works, or the Covenant of Grace, either of the two themselves, yet may we expect that it should *represent* both the one and the other to them; because in the knowledge of both does the business of Religion, and the whole of it, virtually consist. In the delivery of the Moral Law, and that with Thunder and Lightning, and such Terrour as we read of it, they had a representation of the Covenant of Nature, which *qua talis* is doubtless in our false Estate a Ministration only of Wrath, or Law of sin and death. In their Ceremonial Offerings, and Priestly appointments, though there was a remembrance still of sin, and so matter of bondage and fear, yet had they types of Christ, of remedying Mercy, and the Glory to come. These Sacrifices were brought directly as Mulcts to their King, to deliver them from the danger of present punishment, being Redemptions of their lives, which else they should have forfeited by his Laws, and served, I have said, to the *maintenance of his house*, the Tabernacle and Temple which he was pleased to *keep* up among them: Nevertheless that does not hinder, but God Almighty might make use thereof, farther, for types and representations of other things, *that*

is

is to say Spiritual, and so the Law be a *Pedagogy* under a *temporal* dispensation, leading many to *Heaven*. This is certain, that the Covenants of *Nature* & *Grace* being made with *Man-kind*, are not matters of concernment only to the *Jews*, but to the whole world as well as to them for everlasting life and death; and it is not to be conceived, therefore, that either of them should receive any detriment by the Covenant made with that particular Nation. *This, I say, that the Covenant confirmed before of God in Christ, the Law which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul, that it should make the Promise of no effect.* The Covenant of God in Christ, is the covenant of grace, and that we see a-foot in the world before the Law, and before *Abraham*; for, when it was *confirmed* to *Abraham*, it must be in being before on necessity, and ever was since the Fall, or else none after could be saved. And if this be not disannul'd, then cannot that, whatsoever it be, which is given by this covenant, come to the *Jews* by the Law. For as the Apostle argues, *If there had been a Law given that could have given life, verily Righteousness should have been by the Law*; If the Law of Nature could be kept by man, there would be no need of a covenant of Grace by Christ: So do I argue, if Righteousness unto justification of life, was to come by the Law, the Promise, or Covenant of Grace, as soon as that was given, might be spared. But for-as-much as eternal life and justification does come only by the covenant of grace, it follows that the covenant made with the *Jews*, must needs be a covenant which concern'd their outward state, or political welfare, as I have said; and that neither Salvation nor Condemnation, as to the life to come, was the primary intention, or the direct and proper effect of it.

If Salvation, or Condemnation was the proper issue of the Law, then could neither any of those holy men as the Patriarchs, nor any of the wicked world, who were before the Law, as the men of *Sodom* and *Gomorah* be condemned at the day of Judgment: For where no Law is, there is no Transgression, and so no Condemnation. And indeed, if this covenant was conceived any other than some such thing as I make it, how could it be, that the most substantial part, or body of the *Jews*

Nation ſhould be *Sadducees* in Chriſt's time? The Covenant of Nature is that which lays all the world guilty before God; ſo that *He who believes not, is Condemned already*; he is condemned by the Law of his Creation writ in his heart; he needs no outward Law to condemne him. *Whatſoever things the Law ſaith, it ſaith to them who are under the Law:* If there were no Curſe, nor Death, but that which the *Jews* Law doth ſpeak, then were there none but the *Jew* ſhould ſuffer Condemnation. If a man on the contrary ſide does believe and repent, he needs no other *Law* than that of the *ſpirit of life in Chriſt Jeſus*, to *ſet him free from* this Law *of Sin and Death*. So long as he does not believe, he *abides* under that *Wrath*, and it is not for want of Faith as the *cauſe of his Condemnation* (to juſtify God in not giving all men that alike), but for want of it (*N B*), as that which ſhould be the *remedy*, that he periſhes. Salvation then, and Condemnation which is Eternall, does proceed from the covenants of grace and works; and it is not to be imagined that God ſhould deal otherwiſe with the *Jews* than with the reſt of the world, as to the terms of a future life. *I have ſet before you Life and Death*, ſays *Moſes*. And *Curſed be he that continueth not in all the Law to do it*. But what this *Life* and *Death*, theſe *Bleſſings* and *Curſes* are, we ſee expreſs in *Deuteronomy*, and in the fifth Commandement. The Laws which God did give the *Jews*, were about *Religion*, and about *Civil* matters. Religion concern'd their Eternal, civil things their Temporal good. Yet whether they are commanded the obſervation of the one or the other, the ſanction of both does lye in the threats and promiſes of Temporal bleſſings and judgments. Even as in the Laws of our Realm, Religion and the Service of God is required under a civil forfeiture, when it is the Goſpel it ſelf muſt threaten farther Vengeance to the Tranſgreſſor. In ſhort, herein will lye the miſtery and ſum of all. The Law, as it was in the hand of *Moſes*, and given to the peculiar Nation of the *Jews*, muſt be no other than a temporal covenant, yet did this temporal covenant contain in it *patterns of things* (as the Apoſtle ſpeaks) *in the Heavens*. And as the ten Commandements particularly, written in ſtone, are a tranſcript of the Moral Law written by Nature in our hearts, I do take the Law to *repreſent* the covenant

nant of works, and by vertue of that repreſentation alone, or of that it repreſents, does it operate to future judgment, and is the miniſtration of condemnation. The Law indeed, taken at large, for all that is contained in the whole books of the Old Teſtament, may be ſuppoſed to hold forth whatſoever is in the covenant of works and grace: but the Law taken ſeparately from both, as a third covenant, cannot hold forth any other than the external government of God with propriety over the *Jews*, and that conſiſting in theſe two things, to wit, a hard task of burdenſome dutyes under the danger of temporal judgments, and a redreſs from them by Sacrifices; the one typifying our eſtate according to the Law of works; and the other, the grace which comes to us by Chriſt Jeſus.

What uſe may be made of this, I leave to minds which are ſearching. I am never out of my way I count, ſo long as I meet with any ſuch. Only there is *one* in a late Book, who ſeems to fall a little too hard on a grave Preacher for making the diſpenſation of the Old Teſtament, in ſome Sermons of his, to be more terrible than ours under the New: For doing which he hath thus much the more reaſon indeed, if (as I ſay) that life and death which is Eternal, comes not from the *Law*, but from the *Covenants* of *Works* and *Grace*, which were before it, and cannot be made voyd by it. There is therefore the *Believing Penitent* Sinner, and the *Unbelieving and Impenitent*. For the man that ſins and repents not, it is true that he hath no leſs reaſon to fear under the Goſpel than under the Law; but rather the more, in regard that the threatnings of the Law were directly, I take it only of temporal puniſhments, but the Goſpel does manifeſtly threaten Eternal. *Of how much ſorer punniſhment* (ſays the Scripture) *worthy he is?* But for the Penitent and Believing, the caſe is otherwiſe, and the *Reprover* ſhould know it is in regard of ſuch, that this difference is to be holden. It is true then, the Penitent *Jew* had the Promiſe to truſt to as well as we, but yet he was ſtill under the Law, and not we: and the Law it ſelf did engender to bondage, as in the Scripture before quoted. He had the *Promiſe* as well as we, but he could not *look unto it* as well as we, he had a *vail* over him as we have not, that he could not *ſtedfaſtly look unto the end of that*

which

which was abolished. This is most apparent that the *Jews* were in the dark as to their understanding of the covenant, and Christ that End, after another manner than we are, and the more they were in the dark, the more must they be in doubts and fears, and upon this foundation is this difference built ordinarily, I suppose, by the Understanding. Nevertheless, there is yet this one thing or two farther, that under the Law, there was recourse to be had still unto their Sacrifices, which were *remembrances of sin*, I said before, and consequently of terrour and bondage, seeing if they failed, they had reason of fear in regard of temporal punishments, as much more then we, as they had to expect temporal blessings more then we upon their obedience, upon the account they were under a peculiar temral covenant. Adde hereunto, These temporal things under that covenant were resemblances, patterns, and in some sence portendments of future. *To what end then served the Law*, says the Apostle, as you may likewise adjoyn from this supposition? *It was added because of Transgressions. The Law entred that the offence might abound.* Again, *By the Law comes the knowledg of sin*; and though sin was in the world before, men were not apt to impute it to themselves without a Law. The Law then was for the brideling the *Jews* from sin, and through the conviction of sin upon the Conscience, and that temporal death they saw due to them in the Beasts that were slain in their behalfs, they might be driven in the sence of their spiritual estates, to the remedying Law of Mercy upon Repentance, which is the substance of the Promise which God had given to their fore-Fathers, and has established in the Gospel. *For Christ was the end of the Law for Righteousness*; *and the Law was a Schoolmaster* (says the Apostle) *to drive us to Christ.*

For

Of the Law *and* Goſpel.

FOr this Theam, I ſhall have need to ſpeak the leſs in regard of what hath been ſaid already. That which I have to offer, I ſhall ſerve in by way of ſtriking light at a paſſage or two in a Book which hath been *intended* in the Chapter before, but not *named*. I am ſenſible how many there are, who being taken with the Preaching of *free grace*, are too apt to diſrelliſh other Preachers, who preſs more unto *Duty*; and I think that Writer does not therefore ſpend his pains without good cauſe about the conſiſtency of good works with the Goſpel and Juſtification. It is objected againſt ſuch Divines, that they are but Legal Preachers, and that they impeach the grace of God by putting men ſo much on Doing. To the one his Anſwer is, *They Preach not the Works of* Moſes *Law, but the Works Chriſt enjoyns:* To the other he tells us, *The Law and Goſpel both put us upon doing, but not the ſame thing, nor with the ſame diſpoſition*, which he explains; *The Goſpel gives better rules of life, and power to do according to them, with a more willing and chearful mind than the Law did.* I will here under favour of this ingenious perſon, uſe a few words.

For the firſt, I look not on this Anſwer ſo jejunely, as if the meaning of the Authour was only that they preach not the *Ceremonial* Law; for who need be inform'd of that, or that the ceremonial Law does no longer oblige? But ſuppoſing the Moral Law it ſelf coming under a double conſideration, to wit, as delivered by *Moſes*, and as it is in the hand of *Chriſt*; it is this indeed which is worth his enquiry, how the dutyes of the ten Commandements, or thoſe good works which we, as well as the *Jews* are bound to perform, are obligatory in the one reſpect, and not in the other. Now ſhould he have uſed theſe words, as ſome of our Divines do, and by the diſtinction intend only, we are not obliged to good works in the point of Juſtification, but out of gratitude to our Redeemer, or to that purpoſe, he muſt run ſtreight into that *premunire* which he ſtrives to avoid, to wit, of Juſtification by Faith only. If he

ſtick upon this, that the Law, as it was in the hand of *Moſes*, was given for a temporal covenant, and not ſo as it is in the hand of *Chriſt*, I do not ſee what that does ſignify to the objection. This is that therefore which is to be ſaid, and to be conceived therefore what he intends. By the works of the Law, underſtand we, that exact obedience which is required unto living by the Law, *Do this and live*. By the works Chriſt enjoyns, let us underſtand that ſincerity only in our obedience which God requires unto our *living by Faith*, or accepts though imperfect through Chriſt. Good works are not exacted now of any in the *firſt* ſence, but good works are required of all in the *ſecond*. That Preacher that ſhould Preach obedience to the decalogue, as neceſſary to life in the former ſence, were a *legal* Preacher indeed; but that Preacher that preaches obedience and good works in the ſecond ſence, is but a Preacher of the *Goſpel*, and may not preach otherwiſe, as he tenders his Hearers Salvation. *And behold, one came to Chriſt, and ſaid, what ſhall I do that I may inherit Eternal Life? And he ſaid to him, if thou wilt enter into life, keep the Commandements.* The Commandements then, I ſay, may be conſidered as the *matter* of the covenant of works, or our *Legal* Righteouſneſs: or as the *matter* of the covenant of grace, or our *Evangelical* Righteouſneſs. In the former ſence, if any man could perform them, he ſhould merit Eternal Life, and be ſure to have it; but there is no man can keep them as they are ſo required. In the latter ſence, there is no man but muſt keep them (as to the prevalent intereſt of his will, which conſtitutes integrity), and does, that ever was, and is finally juſtified and ſaved.

For the ſecond, we have two or three things to be touched: In the firſt place, I do not believe (craving that Gentlemans pardon) that the Goſpel gives any *better*, or any other rules of life, than what are contained in the Law. It is true that Chriſt hath inſtituted other Sacraments, but it is the Moral Law we call the rule of life, and that Chriſt came not to bring us the Syſteme of any new Law, but to explain and eſtabliſh the Law Moral (which the *Jews*, I count, and *Gentiles* both ever had, the one by the light of Nature, the other by Revelation alſo) is a truth ſomthing more conſiderable, as I take it, than that alone

lone which our Divines contend for againſt the *Socinian* in this *matter*. In the next place, when Divines make a difference between the Law and Goſpel, as to the power of doing, that the Law *commands to do*, but the Goſpel *gives power to do*; The Law commands the tale of *Brick*, but gives not *Straw*, and the like expreſſions: I doubt not, but they have ſome verity at the bottom, which ſhould have nakedly been laid down, if he could, by this Bright perſon, For the delivery of things after others, by roat, without diſgeſtion, is the great fault which he finds ſo often in other mens Books. The *Law* and *Goſpel* we know are liable to a diverſe acception. By the *Law* moſt properly, I think, we are to underſtand that Law which is written in the heart of man by Nature, in *Adams* and ours, the copy whereof, is the ten Commandements, called the Moral Law: and by the Goſpel, the Law of Chriſt; That which he delivered, and his Apoſtles. The matter whereof in both, may be conſidered *qua fœdus*, or *qua regula*, to uſe the terms of others. *Qua regula*, the things required in the Law moral, and the Goſpel or Law of Chriſt, are the ſame: but *qua fœdus*, the Law of Nature originally requires theſe things in *perfection*, to be accepted unto life; and the Law of Chriſt requires them in *ſincerity* only, accepting them, though imperfect unto life, through his Mediation and Redemption. This is the only difference that concerns us here between the Law and the Goſpel. The Law then and Goſpel both being conſidered as the Doctrin of life, how does this Authour ſpeak, that the *one* gives power, and not the *other*? The rule ſhews what we are to do; the power to do, is not given by our being ſhown. That which therefore is to be underſtood by ſuch terms, may come to this; that, that which the Law thus taken (that is the Law of our Creation, and *quâ fœdus*) does require of man, is not in our power to do, and conſequently none can attain Salvation by it: but that which the Goſpel requires, we have power to perform; and if we be not wanting to God's Grace, upon the performance we ſhall be ſaved. In the third place, when he ſays the Goſpel enables us to do with a more willing and chearful mind then the Law; if we underſtand this kind of ſpeech, as thoſe Divines do I think ordinarily that uſe it, in ſuch a ſence, that Chriſt ha-

ving done all our works for us, that Righteouſneſs of his which was a moſt perfect conformity to the Law, being imputed, or accepted in our behalf for life, there are no good works now required of us to do, but only as the teſtification of our thankfulneſs, and belief of this, and therefore we perform all we do with gladneſs, joy, and love altogether, without bondage, fear, or doubt, it being not in order to our Juſtification, though we miſcarry in the doing: I do apprehend this Learned Man would be one of the firſt to diſlike ſuch Teaching. Yet is there thus much here of truth alſo, That when the Law (ſo taken as before) does give us no heart at all to do that which *through the fleſh* (as the Apoſtle ſpeaks) is indeed *impoſſible* to any, the Goſpel does give us encouragement to do, upon the account, that what it requires may be performed, and by that performance (through the aſſiſtance of God's Spirit) as the condition, Man is both juſtified and ſaved.

I know well that St. *Auguſtine* does uſe the like expreſſions, and I think often, but he does explain his meaning, which comes to this; that when the *Law of works* commands us what is our duty, and threatens us if we do it not, the *Law of Faith* (he counts) directs us to God for his aſſiſtance, grace, or ſpirit, to do what he commands. I do not forget neither, that God hath promiſed his ſpirit, and ſo his grace for the performance of the New Covenant; and though it does not follow, that if *Adam* had ſtood, he ſhould not therefore have given man his grace and ſpirit for performing the *perfect* obedience of the Old, as well as to us for the performing *imperfect* under the New, ſeeing that Father does ſpeak of *grace* to *Adam*, as to us; and if we ſhould aſcribe the obedience he performed, during his Innocency to his own ſtrength, and not to the adjutory of God's ſpirit altogether, he would not endure it: Yet if the Authour, or thoſe Divines of ours that ſpeak as he does, will chooſe rather to make good what they ſay upon the contrary aſſertion, then can I tell how to underſtand with them. When God made Man at firſt, we know, he endued him with original righteouſneſs. Let us ſuppoſe this righteouſneſs alone, ſufficient to him for the performing the Law, unto which he was made; ſo that before the fall, there was no need of that we call *grace*

(which

(which is properly ſuch help of the ſpirit, as conſiſts in the healing and relief of our falne eſtate) to enable man to do that which he had ſtrength to perform by *nature*, until he did voluntarily deflect from it. But when he was fallen, and loſt that righteouſneſs, which was his ſtrength, then are we to conceive a need ſtreight, both of a new Law, to be lowerd, brought down, or fitted to his weakneſs, that he may be *able*; and alſo of grace, that he may be made *willing* to perform it. And thus ſhall there be grace, the ſpirit, and the promiſe of it belonging to the Covenant of our Redeemer, when there was none, nor need of it, to belong to the covenant of our Creation. However, there is this I count moſt certain, and I would have it to be noted, that the ſpirit which is promiſed or given to man for his obedience to God, is promiſed and given only in reſpect to *this Covenant*, not for the performance of the *Covenant of Nature*, for then ſhould *Adam* never have falne, nor we have had any need of a Redeemer.

It is true, that there are ſome Divines are ſo much (with *Auſtin*) to have *Adams* ſtanding (ſuppoſing he had ſtood) to be of grace, that they will have mans original righteouſneſs to be a work (or habit) *ſupernatural*, from which, when *Adam* fell, he returned, (as they would teach us) to his *pure naturals*, and ſo his Poſterity are born. But this is a kind of Pelagianiſme, no ways to be received: For what indeed ſhould be a Creatures *Nature*, if that be not, which it receives from its *Creation*. Beſides, if mans original righteouſneſs be not lookt on as *natural*, how ſhall original ſin, which conſiſts in the loſs of it, be defined by the *depravation* of our *nature*, according to the doctrin of the Church of *England*, as well as the Catechiſme of the Aſſembly? Neither is Dr. *Taylor* here to be heard, who cannot abide that, that (whatſoever he will call it) which we contract from *Adam* without any will of our own, ſhould be held to be ſin, or ſo much as damnable, though it ſhould be granted him through Chriſt's redemption actually to damn no body. It may be the want of a plainer conſideration, what the immediate benefit of Chriſt's redemption to the world, is, made that excellent perſon think this ſo grievous. It is not grievous, I hope, that God ſhould give a Law to his Creature according

to his nature; and that therefore having made man righteous, he ſhould require of him to continue in that righteouſneſs, and walk up according to it. It neceſſarily follows without any thing elſe, that this Law being made in Innocency, muſt condemne all man-kind, in whom this righteouſneſs and perfection is no longer to be found; ſo that by nature, or according to this Covenant of mans nature, we are, and muſt be all the Children of wrath, as the Apoſtle ſpeaks. It would now be indeed a grievous thing if God ſhould deal with any in that juſtice, as he might according to this Covenant; and therefore it hath pleaſed him according to a *Righteouſneſs of his* declared in the Goſpel, in oppoſition to the righteouſneſs of this Covenant of works, to give us his Son; who by the work of his Mediation for man-kind, ſhould prepare a remedying Law, or univerſal conditional remiſſion againſt that condemnation. As for Children then, if they are Baptized, we are to account they do perform this Covenant, or new Law, by the Faith of their Parents bringing them to Baptiſme. *This is my Covenant you ſhall keep, every man-child ſhall be Circumciſed.* If they be not Baptiſed, we are yet to look on them as ſuch who have not broken this new Law, or never refuſed and rejected their remedy; and ſo long as by the Redemption of Chriſt, they are delivered over with all the world from the Covenant of works, to the new Law to be judged, I will not be the man that ſhall condemn one Infant to Hell, or unto torments; although, if there be any that will make a difference of place, or ſtate in the future life for Children, proportionable only to the difference there is between performing the condition, and not being guilty of any breach at all of it, I will not gain-ſay them, nor determine any thing in a matter ſo lubricous, and above what is written.

To return; By the Law and the Goſpel, it may be thought perhaps by ſome, that we are to underſtand the ſtate of the Old and New Teſtament; and ſo muſt this Authour mentioned be made to conceive that *David*, and the like holy men, had not the ſame ſpirit or power, or not ſo much, to enable them to obſerve God's precepts, as we have now, when he uſes theſe expreſſions. That the ſpirit was given under the Goſpel as to his miraculous gifts in another meaſure, then under the Law. I be-

believe; and that such Texts as *the Spirit was not yet given, because Christ was not yet glorified*, and that, *they had not yet heard that there was a Holy Ghost*, with the like, may be happily so understood, I believe: But to think that the Spirit, as to sanctification of the heart, and inclining it to a ready service of God, was not given under the Old Testament as well as under the the New, is a conceit I will not fasten on any. To say it is given more to us now, than to *David*, *Samuel*, *Jeremy*, and such persons in respect to this end, will yet require explanation and proof, if that be intended wholly by these speeches.

Before I pass, there is one passage of this apt Writer, I cannot but note with much approbation. *It is Grace that accepts of our Repentance, and Obedience after we have sinned.* This passage contains more in it, then the most are like to be aware of. The Scripture tells us in several Texts, that by Grace we are saved, & freely justified, and not by Works. By Works we are to understand the works of the Law, and that *qua factas*, as before; and no body is justified or saved by these works, they being above the ability of any to perform. By Grace, *I* will understand with him this accepting our sincere, though imperfect obedience for life through Christ, as if it were perfect righteousness. *Not unto him that worketh*, that is, unto him that hath not performed the works of the Law, which if they were perfect, he should live by them: *but unto him that believeth on him that justifies the ungodly*, that is, but is ungodly in reference to these works, or is one that his Conscience tells him, hath sinned, and does sin, or is imperfect, and falls short of these works, yet believes that God is gracious and merciful for all that, and will pardon these sins and failings, if he repent and walk sincerely, though imperfectly, *his Faith is imputed for Righteousness*; his *Faith*, that is such a believing this, as produces that repentance and sincere walking, is *imputed to him for Righteousness*; that is, is made to stand him in that stead as a perfect righteousness would do; so that through grace, or this gracious acceptance, he shall live by it. There are works (if *I* may still say over, what hath been somwhere also said before) that would make life to be of debt according to God's Covenant of Nature, if any could perform them, and so there are none justified or saved by works, for *all*

have

have ſinned and fall ſhort (under this ſence) *of the glory of God:* Or there are works that cannot be accepted or imputed unto life, but through grace; and ſo is it, that by grace only, or *gratis*, that the Scripture teaches us we are juſtified and ſaved. Nay, the acceptance of our imperfect, ſincere obedience for righteouſneſs, or that we ſhould live by it, is that very grace it ſelf that ſaves us. So well am I pleaſed with this Note from that Authour.

If this ſeem to ſavour too much of inculcation, you muſt pardon me. I do apprehend that the Doctrin of grace and juſtification, whereof I have been, and therefore am ſtill the longer, hath been the occaſion of ſeveral apprehenſions in good men, that inſtead of being *conducive* to, have proved but *hinderances* of, true ſober practical Godlineſs. There are two of theſe mentioned by the ſame underſtanding perſon.

The one is a conceit, that a Chriſtian may not avoyd ſin, and do good, for fear of Hell, and to obtain Heaven, that is for the ſake of Reward. This the Mentioner hath confuted with plain Text, that it needs not a ſecond hand: Onely, that it may not needleſly diſquiet any, I will advance this contrary truth; that whatſoever perſon, out of any principle, fear, or hope, or love, does, or ſhall in the prevalent intentions of his Soul, and endeavour as to the conſtant tenour of his life, prefer his Eternal Salvation before his Fleſh-pleaſing in this world, is ſurely in a good Eſtate, the Converted man, or the Godly man, that ſhall be ſaved. *He that does Righteouſneſs is born of God.* I will ſuppoſe him a Chriſtian, and one that acts according to the Sripture; but if he be a Heathen, and acts herein but fully up to his light, I dare not deny the ſame of him. And indeed, what is that pure love of God, out of which you will ſay alone, a man muſt act? *If you love me*, ſays Chriſt, who knows beſt, *keep my Commandements.* The love of God, and keeping his Commandments are the ſame. The commands of God are to be kept that we may inherit Eternal Life, Chriſt tells the Ruler in the Goſpel expreſs (I have noted before), and conſequently we may love God to that end. If man could do any good to God, by his duties, or any hurt by his ſins, then ſhould I believe there was ſome other end of our duty, than man's Salvation.

tion. You may ſay, this appears ſelfiſh, or ſelf-love only I anſwer that, that man then, who does but love himſelf ſo as to ſeek the Salvation of his Soul above his fleſh, this world, and any thing therein, is the man he ſhould be in the ſight of God. If you ſtick at it, conſider, what is Salvation? A loving God, a delighting in him, a conformity to him. I love God in keeping his Commandements in this life, that I may be conformed to him, and have complacency in him to all Eternity. I will adde, our Orthodox Divines ſay not (and are not to be ſo underſtood) that good works may not be done with reſpect to the reward; but with reſpect to the reward, as due to them *ex condigno*. For to expect that God ſhould accept of what we do, in bearing with our failings, and rewarding us *out of Grace*; when we walk ſincerely before him, is but to act our Faith on, or putting our truſt in, his declared goodneſs, Chriſts Merits, and the promiſes of the Goſpel.

The other Apprehenſion is, that a Chriſtian muſt not *live on his own Purſe or Earnings*. A pretty ſound of ſomthing, which (as I ſuppoſe) does ſignify that which other Divines intend by *Reſting in Duty*. There is therefore a reſting in *Duty*, I may ſay, and a reſting on *God in Duty*. I doubt not but a Chriſtian is to truſt to God for whatſoever he ſeeks of him upon the performance of his duty, when it were but preſumption to do ſo without that performance. It is true, that no man, by any thing he can do (ſeeing when he hath done all, he is but an unprofitable Servant) can deſerve or merit any thing from God's hand (and much leſs his ſaving Grace, which is moſt free) ſo as it may be properly ſaid to be earned, as wages is due unto work, or to make his bleſſings of debt; yet is a Chriſtian by his prayers, and the like duty, ſaid to get, or obtain from God whatſoever he hath from him; and as a man does live on his Eſtate which he gets, ſo may a Chriſtian be ſaid to live his ſpiritual life, upon the riches of God's grace which he gets by his duty. The want of truſting to duty therefore, in a right ſenſe, is indeed, I doubt me, more reprovable in our Proteſtants ordinarily than their reſting in duty. And I am ſeriouſly troubled very often, at what I have obſerved in ſome of our ſpecial practical Divines about this point of reſting in du-

ties (I will particularly name Mr. *Shepheards ſincere Convert*), which is enough to bring any man Religiouſly melancholly (for the more pious his Soul is in the caſe, the more liable it muſt be to ſuch ſtroaks) into deſperation. I will, therefore, ſay thus much in zeal againſt that danger. Let a man be but careful of two things about *reſting* in duty, and trouble himſelf henceforth no more, but about the *doing* of it. The firſt is, Let him take heed of making any duty a pillow to lay his head on to reſt in ſin. Thus it is dangerous indeed to reſt in duty; and this may be either when a man thinks he may ſin, and go on in it, becauſe he Prays, gives Almes, or the like; as if that would bear him out: Or chiefly, when a man ſhall ſit down ſhort of ſincere Converſion, by doing of ſome duty, that is by taking up in leaving ſome ſins, and doing many things he did not before, he ſhall content himſelf, and not come up to that univerſal unreſerved, giving up himſelf to Chriſt, as is required of him to that ſincerity of life, which is the condition of Salvation. This is the moſt deadly, dangerous reſting in duty that I will admoniſh every Soul of. And then for the ſecond, I will ſay only, Let him be a Proteſtant, which I count he is, and I doubt not but his opinion alone againſt merit, and that he is juſtified through Chriſt, will ſecure him for the reſt of this buſineſs. Provided though, he remembers ſtill that humility, and the like qualification of Soul, when he hath done all he can do, is alſo his duty.

And now after I have ſpoken of theſe Heads, if any be otherwiſe minded in whatſoever I have hitherto ſaid, and are reſolved to keep to that only which they count the ſoundeſt *Calviniſme* in them all, I will be ſo candid, as to lay down their doctrin for them, to the beſt advantage. God hath Elected ſome to Salvation. Chriſt dyed only for them. That which he hath Purchaſed by his Death, is not only the benefit conditionally, but Faith it ſelf the condition. Faith is the perſwaſion of a man, that Chriſt hath died particularly for him, and ſo his ſins are forgiven. This perſwaſion, or apprehenſion of Chriſt, makes Chriſt ones own, and ſo juſtifies inſtrumentally, without works, either Legal or Evangelical. and how, alſo to ſerve this turn, I have ſet down in my paper of Juſtification, *page* 15. No

man

man can be ever, in good earneſt, thus perſwaded, but the Elect, for whom alone this Faith is purchaſed. When a Miniſter then declares the Goſpel, and requires of all in God's name to Believe, to wit, to believe particularly that Chriſt hath dyed for their ſins, as knowing not, for his part, who the Elect by name be, there is no fear of hurt unto any, ſeeing no perſon on earth ſhall be able to be perſwaded hereof indeed (that perſwaſion, with *Calvin* and *Luther*, being true Faith), but the Elect only. Beſides, as ſoon as this perſwaſion once is but wrought, it does ſo poſſeſs the Soul with love and gratitude to the Redeemer, that it conſtrains it to Chriſtian duty; ſo that unfained Converſion, Self-denyal, a Crucifixion with Chriſt to the world and the fleſh, and the life of God, and that with perſeverance to the end, do follow as naturally (to wit, according to the *new Nature*) as the Fig-tree brings forth Figgs, or the Olive, Olives, without all poſſibility of ſeparation from it. This Doctrin, if any will ſo concatenate the parts, does ſeem to me to carry a kind of myſterious authority in it, that I find ſome awe for it at my heart, although really, I am convinced both of the danger of it, and alſo (excepting only in the firſt propoſition) that it is untrue. So far am I from deſpiſing of thoſe, againſt whom the ſpirit of that Authour, in the book intimated, ſeems ſo much over-ſharpened: when yet I do encline in my own ſentiments to hang things together, much rather after his faſhion, than theirs, who would look upon me as more Evangelical, in ſuch a Determination.

Deo Gloria mihi Condonatio.

J. H.

ERRATA.

PAge 16. l. 21. for *deſires* read *deſerves*, p. 18. l. 7. for *Clouds* read *Cloud*.